



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

I AM greatly obliged to Dr. Davidson for his scholarly remarks on *JQR.*, IV, 621-34, and I would like to add a few words in reply.

(1) First of all it is proper to answer the question. How many Abraham Hakohen are known from the Genizah? As far as I know, there are five different Abraham Hakohen. We can give the following list of them :

A. Abraham Hakohen in Schechter's *Saadyana*, p. 67, ll. 5 ff., and MS. Brit. Museum Or. 5554, B. No. 20, where we read :

B. l. 24 f. ישראל הכהן יברכו חי וקיים
ואברהם הכהן משרתך יאויים,
 וטובתו תהא שפעת כמו שפעיים
 ולבן דודו עמרם הכהנים מבחריה

B. Abraham ben Amram Hakohen, see Schechter, *loc. cit.*, p. 64, 12.

C. Abraham ben Jachin Hakohen, Schechter, *loc. cit.*, p. 41.

D. Abraham ben Joseph Hakohen in MS. Adler, No. 223; see *ZDMG.*, 67, 637, and *JQR.*, IV, 623: תאלוף ר' אברהם הכהן: ה[חבר ?] בחבורת סנהדרין הגדולה בן מר' ור' יוסף ראש ישיבת ארץ ישראל.

E. Abraham Hakohen ben Isaac. I found the name in T-S. 18 J. 14. 5 (the letter is written by the Gaon Solomon, and bears the signature . . . (שלמה הנרכה לישועת אל . . .), and T-S. 13 J. 19. 3 (there is signed ה[עיר] ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב אל . . . (שלמה הנרכה לישועת אל . . .); T-S. 13 J. 19. 18 is a letter of condolence by Elijah Hakohen, the later Gaon to בן דודינו כנ"ק מר' וכ' אברהם הכהן שר העדה (שר העדה) Since Abraham Hakohen is styled in the former letters in the same way

we are fully justified in regarding that Abraham as a member of the gaonic family in Palestine.

We have now to turn to the more important task, namely to settle the dates of these five Abraham Hakohen approximately as far as possible. The first one is mentioned in the panegyric published by Schechter, and now a part of it has turned up in a British Museum Fragment. The newly-found fragment is in so far of great importance for our question, because it enables us to settle the time of the numerous personalities mentioned therein. It is especially important for our question, since Abraham Hakohen is regarded as the writer of the poems!¹ From the new Fragment we learn that the man to whom the poems were addressed had four sons, *Isaac, Jacob, Sahl, and Joseph*.² There is no doubt that their father's name was Abraham. His brother is mentioned, however, without his name.³ Further, we hear of his sister's son,⁴ of Ali Hakohen,⁵ Israel Hakohen, Amram Hakohen, and finally of our Abraham Hakohen.

Who are, now, these men? Schechter has published a series of poems, where the same names (Ben Ali Hakohen, Israel, Abraham and Amram, all Kohanim) recur as in our fragment. If we want a further proof that the Brit. Mus. Fragment is a part of the Cambridge Fragment, we have to consider only the acrostic . . . ע ל ע די ע . . . Schechter's has it also.

¹ See *ZfHB.*, 7, 112.

² B. l. 11 f.

חסון ישיתך נצור מלרקוב
ונטעי גנתך יצחק ויעקב,

וגם סהל ויוסף יישר למו עקוב,
ואחיותיהם ואמם המהללת בדוריה.

³ B. l. 15

היה אתה ואחייך גדולינו הנעים

⁴ B. l. 18

עדן הטוב אשר לצדיקים צפון

בכף נכבדנו חסן בן אחותך יהי חפון.

⁵ B. l. 21

דגל הברכה יקום בהתרוממן,

לבן עלי הכהן בן אחי אמר.

Schechter thought that 'their contents represent a panegyric of a head of the Academy of מרוסיה' (p. 63; cf. 66, 8-9). Schechter drew attention to the last great Geonim in Sura, to Saadya and the last Gaon Samuel ben Hofni. If that were so, then we ought to expect at least the name of Dosa the son of Saadya Gaon (Schechter, p. 65), or Israel the son of Samuel ben Hofni. The man was Abraham (see *ZfHB.*, VII, 112). We venture now to suggest that the hero of the poems was none else than Abraham, the father of Sahalon (on the name סהלאן and סהל, see Steinschneider, *JQR.*, XI, p. 316). It still remains unsolved, why in course of time Sahalon and not one of the other brothers, as Isaac or Jacob, became the main representative of this family. That we cannot explain now. Sahalon ben Abraham is well known by the letters he received frequently from Salomo ben Judah Gaon. T-S. 20. 6 contains the marriage contract between Sahalon ben Abraham and Esther, the daughter of Joseph ben Amram, the judge (השופט), dated Fustat, 1037. Poznański mentions him among the אנשי קירואן (see his *Esquisse historique sur les Juifs les Kairouan*, Varsovie, 1909, p. 44) on account of the Document signed by him 794 C.E., 345 Doc. (see Hirschfeld, *Arabic Portion of Cairo Genizah at Cambridge*, V, pp. 3-4, reprinted from the *JQR.*, 1904). Then Sahalon was already, 1034, the head of a court or community. Sahalon's father is styled Haber in the great Synhedrion (T-S. 13 J. 11. 5) and (T-S. 13 J. 13. 28) as already deceased. Before or about 1030 Solomon Gaon wrote many letters to Sahalon about the distress and sufferings of the Jews in the Holy Land (see my article 'Die Wirren unter dem Fatimiden al-Zahir und die Juden in Palästina', in Becker's *Islam*, 1914). If our suggestion is right, and there is nothing which may be said against it, we may say that this Abraham lived before 1030. We get thus a piece of family history and the date of Abraham Hakohen, who lived according to these proofs between 1000 and 1030. A fact which clearly justifies the mentioning of his name in connexion with the published fragments. But we have even further support than would seem at first sight.

We need not consider Abraham Hakohen, who lived perhaps

as late as 1200, or the next one, whom we mentioned under C, because his date is entirely unknown. Yet, a very important personality seems to me to be Abraham, the son of Joseph Gaon. Joseph lived about 989 (see *ZDMG.*, 67, 637). My suggestion that this Abraham was the son of the afore-mentioned Gaon Joseph was attacked by Poznański (*ibid.*, 68, 122), as far as I see, without any reason. For we see clearly that Joseph, the second, who died 1053 was never called Gaon. I have many proofs for the correctness of my view. First of all Worman, who went through the unique and most valuable Collection in the University Library at Cambridge, will bear me out, for he says: the latter has יוסף 'שלמה הראש הישיבה מכ' as signature. That means even after the death of Solomon, his son was never styled neither did he style himself Rosh Yeshibat Geon Jacob (see *JQR.*, XIX, 725). But one might say that he was not called Gaon by himself, or by his contemporaries, but that after his death, when there was no more fear of Daniel ben Azariah (see Schechter, *Saadyana*, p. 88), he was so styled. Now I rely upon two witnesses: T-S., 20. 31, dated 1092, is signed as the third member of the Court by Solomon Hakohenben Rabbi Joseph, *Ab Hayeshiba*, ז"ל (Schechter, p. 81, n. 2). It is quite impossible that this Solomon was the son of Joseph the first, who was even by the Geonim of Babylon considered as their colleague (see more about Solomon ben Joseph in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, vol. XXII, 155, and *ibid.*, 247). Another son of Joseph, the second, מרייות, signed Fragment Adler, No. 2557, and he styles his father likewise as אב הישיבה. I still think that Fragment Adler refers to Joseph the first. Therefore we have only to choose between Abraham Hakohen A and D. The question remains now whether these two are different persons or not. For we see from MS. Adler that the latter was also experienced in the art of versifying. It was, therefore, according to my opinion, justified, to bring the poems in connexion with these two men, named Abraham ben Joseph Hakohen. There can be no doubt that our poems are to be considered with these two names, which perhaps represent one and the same person.

The last one, Abraham ben Isaac Hakohen recurs in Fragment Oxford 2876. 67 as Abu Ishak Abraham ben Ishak, and T-S., 13 J. 15. 14, where a poetical epistle is preserved mostly in Aramaic. It is according to Worman (*JQR.*, XIX, 734) headed by the composer Zakkai Hanasi ben Jedidiah Hanassi. The composer was perhaps a Karaite. Abraham must have been a highly influential personage and was related, as we saw above, to the gaonic family. However, he has nothing to do with the writer of our fragments. I may be allowed to refer here to another point of the history of the Palestinian Geonim, which ought to have further consideration. I came across a fragment dated Damascus 4797, דתשצ"ז—1037, and signed by Elijah הכהן החבר בסנהדר' גר' ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב זצל. Now if we take זצל for a eulogy for the deceased, then the Gaon Solomon ben Judah, who was the Gaon in Jerusalem about 1046 (see Bacher, *JQR.*, XV, 81 and Epstein, *Monatsschrift*, 47, 341), is a different one. Poznański (*RÉJ.*, 66, 68, and *ZDMG.*, 68, 123) endeavoured to show that there were two Geonim with the name Solomon. His references are not supported by facts, and therefore not convincing. About Solomon ben Joseph Ab bet Din he says: 'Auf Salomo ben Jehuda folgte nicht der Vice-Gaon Josef Hakohen, der vielleicht inzwischen gestorben war, sondern dessen Sohn Salomo, von dem wir überhaupt wenig wissen.' I have to confess that I know nothing at all about this Solomon Gaon ben Joseph Ab Bet Din, and Poznański unfortunately forgot to give us his collected material concerning this Solomon ben Joseph. The second Solomon, who was according to Epstein no priest, was, as Poznański is going to prove, the son of a Judah and grandson of Berechiah (*ZDMG.*, 68, 121). The reference given in *RÉJ.*, 66, 64, 61, n. 5, is not satisfactory, since the Oxford Fragment 2729. 5 has nothing else but the name, and he, Solomon, is not even called Gaon, according to the meagre note. I will not ask the question: Who knows how many Judah ben Berechiah were there? Despite of it, the date of the quoted fragment is by no means sure. First of all the time of the poem has to be settled. I found further a fragment in the most valuable

Collection of Mr. Adler in his MS. 3363. 7, wherefrom I copied the following passage :

ואם תשאל מי הוא זה ובן מי שלמה בן יהודה הרא רכסו
 אשר חבר לך השר [ביושר?] לבבו? ובנתר ובבורית כבסו.

As I have shown on other occasions, the dignity of Solomon ben Judah was fiercely attacked, and we have to await still further details which may throw sufficient light on this dark and mostly unknown chapter of the history of the Jews. Finally, I mention only, that we infer from T-S. 13 J. 21. 9 that Solomon's native country was not Palestine. The Gaon is ill and his secretary communicates about a man who came from ארץ מולדת ארזיניו נאון. The letter is written to Ephraim ben Schemariah.

(2) I cannot accept Dr. Davidson's suggestion that the phrase 4. 32 refers to the Jewish people at large and not to the relation of the writer to heretics. How is 1. 7 ff. and 1. 24 to be explained otherwise? There can be no doubt whatever that there are in the poems personal references in abundance. The writer spoke of the Maccabaeans as of his ancestors and not of the Maccabean period! If the poet wanted to glorify the Maccabaeans as such, he would have spoken of the 25th of Kislev; his intention, however, was surely to tell us the history of his own life and sufferings.

(3) From my notes and first copy made in Cambridge ten years ago, I cannot think it probable that the date does not belong at the head of the first, but at the end of the fourth piece. One would be inclined to agree to Dr. Davidson's suggestion, as I myself considered it several times, yet my pagination of the copy is against it.

A. MARMORSTEIN.

London.